Document Log Item

Addressing	
From	**To**
Peter Peshut <pjp617@uow.edu.au>	Sara Greiner/R9/USEPA/US@EPA Carl Goldstein/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
CC	**BCC**

Description	Form Used: Memo
Subject	**Date/Time**
Re: Deadlines for reports in cannery permits - would like your input.	11/13/2007 01:20 PM

# of Attachments	Total Bytes	NPM	Contributor
0	12,848		Marcela VonVacano

Processing
Comments

Body

Document Body

Sara,

Schedule seems reasonable to me. It appears consistent with previous permit periods.

Peter

---- Original message ----
>Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2007 12:57:19 -0800
>From: Greiner.Sara@epamail.epa.gov
>Subject: Deadlines for reports in cannery permits - would like your input.
>To: Goldstein.Carl@epa.gov, "Peter Peshut" <pjp617@uow.edu.au>

>
>
>
>Carl and Peter - this is what I am thinking with regards to deadlines in
>the cannery permits (in blue). Do these time schedules seem reasonable?
>Let me know if you have any comments/suggestions.
>_____
>Sara N. Greiner
>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
>Clean Water Act Standards and Permits Office
>75 Hawthorne Street, WTR-5
>San Francisco, California 94105
>Telephone: 415-972-3042
>Fax: 415-947-3545
>_____
>
>----- Forwarded by Sara Greiner/R9/USEPA/US on 11/13/2007 12:44 PM -----
>
> "Steven Costa"
> <glatzeldacosta@
> suddenlink.net> To
> Sara Greiner/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
> 11/08/2007 05:07 cc
> PM
> Subject
> Re: Assessment of nutrients from
> Please respond cannery discharges
> to
> "Steven Costa"
> <glatzeldacosta@
> suddenlink.net>
>
>
>
>

>
>
>Sara,
>
>Seems clear to me.
>
>On a related subject can you provide (a rough idea) of the schedule of
>one-time deliverables as you see them. The canneries have asked that I
>prepare next years budget and have asked that I include estimates for
>most
>of the requirements. In particular, can you fill in or confirm the
>following relative to EDP:
>
>Nutrient evaluation
> Work Plan (1 year)
> Report (due by end of third year, unless otherwise specified by EPA)
>QC Plan for Lab
> Plan complete (90 days)
>Cu, Zn, Hg source assessment
> Work Plan (due no later than one year after the effective date of
>the permit, unless otherwise specified by EPA)
> Report (1 year - report due by end of third year, unless otherwise
>specified by EPA)
>TIE/TRE
> Work Plan(due no later than one year after the effective date of the
>permit, unless otherwise specified by EPA)
> Complete (4 yrs)
>Pollution Prevention Plan
> Plan update (90 days?)
>Anything else that will be due other than monitoring reports?

>
>Can we assume the first monitoring episode next year will be done under
>the
>new permit conditions?
>
>Thanks,
>
>Steve
>
>----- Original Message -----
>From: <Greiner.Sara@epamail.epa.gov>
>To: "Steven Costa" <glatzeldacosta@suddenlink.net>;
><Goldstein.Carl@epa.gov>; "Edna Buchan" <ebuchan2@yahoo.com>; "Peter
>Peshut"
><pjp617@uow.edu.au>; "Karen Glatzel" <kargatgdc@suddenlink.net>
>Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2007 2:55 PM
>Subject: Assessment of nutrients from cannery discharges
>
>
>>
>> Hi all,
>>
>> As discussed previously, I have included a permit requirement for the
>> canneries to conduct an assessment of nutrient loading. Here is what
>is
>> in the fact sheet. Please let me know if you have any questions. The
>> permits language will not deviate much more than this.
>>
>> Steve, is it clear from this what is expected of the canneries?
>>
>> sng
>>

>>
>++
>
>>
>> D. Assessment of nutrient loading and assimilative capacity in Pago
>> Pago Harbor
>>
>> No dilution factors are currently available to accurately assess
>> the size of the mixing zone for nutrients and establish water
>> quality-based effluent limitations based on statistical procedures
>> outline in EPA's TSD in the draft permit. The proposed effluent
>> limitations for total nitrogen and total phosphorus are re-established
>> in the draft permit from existing permit limitations based on
>> information derived from several mass-based models and subsequent dye
>> studies conducted in the early 1990s. These models determined that a
>> mixing zone boundary set at 1,300 feet from the diffuser, or the
>30-foot
>> depth contour, whichever is closer, would be able to assimilate 60,000
>> lbs/month of total nitrogen and 12,000 lbs/month of total phosphorus
>> from the canneries discharges. For total nitrogen, assuming a 30-day
>> month, approximately 2,000 lbs/day could be discharged between the two
>> canneries, with the discharge still meeting water quality standards.
>> For total phosphorus, approximately 400 lbs/day could be discharged.

>> Consequently, the StarKist Samoa Inc. and COS Samoa Packing Company,
>> Inc. agreed to portion the total mass between them, for which permit
>> effluent limitations were established.
>>
>> Although nutrients discharged from the combined cannery outfall
>> may not be significantly impacting water quality in Pago Pago Harbor
>> based on receiving water monitoring data, EPA believes that it is
>> important to re-assess nutrient loading from the canneries due to the
>> availability of new effluent and water quality data, and advanced
>> modeling applications that have been developed since 1991. The draft
>> permit requires the permittee, in coordination with COS Samoa Packing
>> Company, Inc., to conduct an assessment of nutrient loading and the
>> existing mixing zone for nutrients. The draft permit requires the
>> permittee, in coordination with COS Samoa Packing Company, Inc., to
>> submit a brief workplan (no more than five pages) that describes the
>> techniques and procedures it will use to assess nutrient loading in
>the
>> receiving water. The draft permit requires that permittee to submit
>the
>> workplan no later than one year after the effective date of the
>permit.
>> _____

>> Sara N. Greiner
>> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
>> Clean Water Act Standards and Permits Office
>> 75 Hawthorne Street, WTR-5
>> San Francisco, California 94105
>> Telephone: 415-972-3042
>> Fax: 415-947-3545
>> _____
>>
>
>